

## **REMARKS**

Applicant has carefully reviewed the Office Action dated February 21, 2006. Applicant has amended Claim 1 to more clearly point out the present inventive concept. Reconsideration and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 11 and 19 have been objected to as the Examiner considers that the recitation “intermediate location” has insufficient antecedent basis. Applicant notes that Claim 1 utilizes the term “an intermediate location” in line 15. Therefore, the term in line 17 “the intermediate location” has antecedent basis. With respect to Claim 11, it does not have the term “intermediate location” contained therein. With respect to Claim 19, the term “intermediate location” is clearly introduced into the claim at line 4 therein. As such, Applicant believes that the antecedent basis for these claims is correct and, therefore, respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection by the Examiner.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being unpatentable over *Ludwig*. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicant’s present inventive concept, as defined by the amended claims, is directed toward the concept of disposing a beacon at a unit at a particular location and transmitting from that beacon a signal containing two codes therein. One of these codes is associated with the beacon unit and the other is associated with a remote location somewhere on a computer network. The concept is to transmit the beacon signal to a receiver at a second location and extract these two codes therefrom. With the use of these two codes, and automatically, the two codes are transmitted to a wireless device, which wireless device then makes a connection to the computer network. The two codes are sent out to an intermediate location on the computer network, the two codes are relayed from the beacon unit to the first receiver that receives the beacon signal and through the wireless device to the computer network at the intermediate location. At the intermediate location, there is stored routing association information in association with the first codes. It is the use of these first codes that provides routing

### **AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE**

SN: 09/703,705

Atty. Dkt. No. PHL-25,506

information. This routing information is transmitted back in a reply packet to the wireless device and the wireless device connected to the associated remote location.

The *Ludwig* device is a device for providing location specific information to a mobile device, which mobile device then uses this information to estimate its geographic location or to transmit the location information to a WWW server that may estimate the geographical location. Although the Examiner as interpreted the *Ludwig* reference as disclosing the limitations of the claim, Applicant does not believe that there is any first and second code that is transmitted from a beacon unit, the Examiner interpreting the base stations as being beacon units, receiving these two codes at a first receiver, which the examiner interprets as the mobile station to be the first unit, and then sending both of these codes to a wireless device, which the examiner is interpreting to be the mobile device (MD), and then transmitting the two codes from this device to a global communication network. At the global communication network there is an association disposed between the first code and a location on the network, which location on the network is returned. This is not the purpose of *Ludwig*, as *Ludwig* merely wants to determine a geographic location of the mobile station. There is no such goal in the present invention. Further, there is no disclosure that the two codes are transmitted from the beacon unit all the way to an intermediate location on the network. As such, Applicant believes that none of Claims 1-20 are anticipated or obviated by the *Ludwig* reference. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. § 102 rejection with respect to Claims 1-20.

The Examiner has also noted in the Office Action that *Ludwig* discloses a GPRS gateway support node GGSN which is accessed by the packet data network due to evaluation of a packet data protocol. The Examiner indicates that this protocol contains routing information for attached users and this routing information is used to tunnel packet data units to mobile stations current point of attachment. The Examiner is utilizing this argument to overcome Applicant's prior argument that there is no step of transmitting a reply packet from an intermediate location to a wireless device such that the wireless device then makes a connection. However, the claims require this reply packet to include routing information associated with the first code from the intermediate location. There is no such disclosure or suggestion in *Ludwig* of such an operation.

**AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE**

SN: 09/703,705

Atty. Dkt. No. PHLY-25,506

The Examiner also indicated that, in response to Applicant's arguments that "no second code is transmitted from the beacon unit that could be an attribute of the beacon unit" was disclosed, that *Ludwig* has a device ID that is further associated with a subscriber number authorized by a carrier as part of the procedures to activate the phone. Again, Applicant believes that there is no disclosure that this code is transmitted to the intermediate location on the network for deciphering thereof.

Applicant has now made an earnest attempt in order to place this case in condition for allowance. For the reasons stated above, Applicant respectfully requests full allowance of the claims as amended. Please charge any additional fees or deficiencies in fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-0780/PHYL0-25,506 of HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.

Respectfully submitted,  
HOWISON & ARNOTT, L.L.P.  
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

/gmh/

Gregory M. Howison  
Registration No. 30,646

GMH/ljo/dd

P.O. Box 741715  
Dallas, Texas 75374-1715  
Tel: 972-479-0462  
Fax: 972-479-0464  
August 14, 2006

**AMENDMENT AND RESPONSE**

SN: 09/703,705  
Atty. Dkt. No. PHLY-25,506